

REMARKS

The applicant has carefully reviewed the official action mailed on September 2, 2009, and the references cited therein. By way of this response, claims 1 and 49-51 have been amended. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks.

The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the official action, claims 1, 3, 5-51, 53 and 55-98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Davis (U.S. 5,796,952) in view of Astiz (U.S. 5,918,012); claims 2 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Davis in view of Astiz and Welsh (U.S. 5,374,951); and claims 4 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Davis in view of Astiz and Lu (U.S. 2003/0110485).

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a method performed by a software agent of a first entity measuring the exposure of an individual to electronic media using a processor to obtain information identifying the electronic media from a cooperative media handler, wherein the cooperative media handler performs a dynamically configurable media research task that is associated with the handling of electronic media by the cooperative media handler. The art cited in the present action fails to teach or suggest a cooperative media handler that performs a dynamically configurable media research task that is associated with the handling of electronic media by the cooperative media handler, as recited in claim 1.

The present action admits on page 3 that Davis does not describe obtaining information identifying electronic media from the claimed cooperative media handler.

The present action asserts that the viewer 31 of Astiz reads on the claimed cooperative media handler. The applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 1 recites a

cooperative media handler that performs a dynamically configurable media research task. The present action indicates that the viewer 31 of Astiz is a specialized view that accepts and processes BTV MIME files, as therefore, the viewer 31 must be configurable. Assuming, *arguendo*, that the viewer 31 corresponds to the claimed cooperative media handler, the viewer 31, though configured to accept and processes BTV MIME files, is not described in the cited portions of Astiz as performing any dynamically configurable media research tasks. There is no description in the cited portions of Astiz that the viewer 31 can perform any task other than what it has already been programmed to perform. Therefore, Astiz also fails to describe a cooperative media handler that performs a dynamically configurable media research task that is associated with the handling of electronic media by the cooperative media handler, as recited in claim 1.

Thus, because neither Davis nor Astiz describes, teaches or suggests a cooperative media handler that performs a dynamically configurable media research task that is associated with the handling of electronic media by the cooperative media handler, as recited in claim 1, no combination of Davis and Astiz can render claim 1 obvious. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and all claims dependent thereon are in condition for allowance for this reason alone.

In addition, the remaining references fail to overcome the above-noted deficiencies of Davis and Astiz and, thus, no combination of Davis, Astiz and these references can render claim 1 unpatentable. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 and all claims dependent thereon are in condition for allowance, for this reason alone.

Independent claims 49-51 and their dependents contain recitations similar to those recitations of claim 1 discussed above. Therefore, the remaining claims are also

believed to be patentable for reasons similar to those set forth above in connection with independent claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. If there are any remaining issues in this application, the applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

The applicant believes no payment is due for this submission. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required to Deposit Account No. 50-2455.

Respectfully submitted,

HANLEY, FLIGHT & ZIMMERMAN, LLC
USPTO Customer Number 81905
150 S. Wacker Drive
Suite 2100
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 580-1020

By: /Mark G. Hanley/
Mark G. Hanley
Registration No.: 44,736
Attorney for Applicant

October 30, 2009